

Y885R
2.578
Cop. 2

A STUDY OF REVOCATIONS
TO THE DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH SERVICES

March 16, 1978 - March 15, 1979

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

DEC 12 1980

STATE DOCUMENTS

A STUDY OF REVOCATIONS
TO THE DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH SERVICES

March 16, 1978 - March 15, 1979

Trudie C. Trotti
Research and Evaluation Unit
S. C. Department of Youth Services
August, 1979

INTRODUCTION

This study resulted from a request by the Agency's Director that the Research and Evaluation Unit investigate certain factors associated with revocations to the Department of Youth Services. Administrative concern focused on the seemingly large proportion of revocations deriving from status/ placement-type problems rather than criminal violations and their effect on the size of the institutional population. In order to examine these issues a study proposal was developed which designated for analysis the pertinent variables of reason for revocation, complete history of offenses/ violations resulting in commitment, and length of revocation stay. When the proposal was approved in March, 1979, it was agreed that research would commence immediately and that the first report would incorporate revocations which occurred during the one year period beginning in March 1978.

As research progressed it became apparent that status and placement violations had indeed accounted for the majority of revocations within this time frame. Furthermore, even after a policy change by Juvenile Placement and Aftercare in January, 1979, to the effect that placement failure did not constitute adequate grounds for revocation, the Department of Youth Services continued to shelter children with placement problems only pending their final J P & A hearing and/or placement resolution.

In order to document with detail recent instances of children being returned to the Agency because of inadequate placement, a section presenting four case studies was appended to the statistical analysis. A full discussion of the methodology employed in the study follows.

METHODOLOGY

For purposes of this study, the term "revocation" was defined as any readmission to a DYS residential school mandated by J P & A because the client in question had violated the terms of his conditional or temporary conditional release. The study population consisted of 86 clients who accounted for 100 such revocations during the one year period beginning on March 16, 1978. It proved necessary, for certain aspects of the analyzation, to divide this population into subgroups of 53 inactive and 33 active clients, and to omit the latter, whose most recent revocations remain incomplete, from consideration of length of stay. Specific variables thus affected are noted in the list below.

Sources of information on the study population included J P & A 's "Revocation Receipt Form," used primarily to determine the reason for revocation, Data Processing printouts, which allowed verification of age, race, sex and date of return, and client folders, which provided histories of DYS contacts as well as conditional release agreements and other types of documentation. Specific variables extracted for analyzation were as follows:

- 1) County of Origin (Family Court/J P & A office handling case)
- 2) Age, race and sex distribution by type of conditional release
- 3) Array of conditional release violations
- 4) Campus assignment during most recent revocation
- 5) Tracking of individual clients by offense history and length of stay
- 6) Average reovcation stay by race, sex and type of violation, inactive clients only
- 7) Average total stay by number of commitments, inactive clients only
- 8) Offense history patterns by number of commitments
- 9) Type of commitment offense/violation by commitment number
- 10) Time span between release and revocation by type of violation

In addition to the statistical analysis, a case history approach was employed to document, by means of specific dates and correspondence, recent instances of children being confined at DYS facilities only because of placement failure.

ANALYZATION

Distribution of Revocations and Clients Revoked by County

Table I presents the distribution by county of revocations and clients revoked, including a breakdown on revocations for status/placement reasons, which accounted for approximately two-thirds of the total. With a relatively small number of revocations distributed over some 29 counties it is difficult to determine cases of over or under-representation. For the most part the larger numbers of revocations/clients revoked appear in counties with large juvenile populations--Greenville, for example. Sumter may be somewhat disproportionate, given eight revocations as compared to the larger counties of Richland (6) and Charleston (7). Aiken, Florence, and Lexington, all very similar to Sumter with regard to juvenile population size, together accounted for only 8 revocations. Multiple revocations on individual clients occurred in Sumter County as well as Aiken, Berkeley, Charleston, Chester, Darlington, Greenville, Greenwood, Lancaster, Lexington and Richland.

Distributions of Clients Revoked by Age, Race and Sex

Table II presents the distribution of all clients revoked by age, race and sex. White clients comprised the slight majority, accounting for 54.7% of the total. Although males were a clear majority, females made up 36.0% of the study population, which was more than double their proportion in the overall institutional population.¹ The average age of all clients revoked was 14.8 years.

¹Females accounted for only 17.2% of all the admissions to DYS residential schools according to the Agency's Annual Report for fiscal 1978.

Table I

DISTRIBUTION OF REVOCATIONS AND CLIENTS
REVOKED BY COUNTY AND TYPE OF REVOCATION

COUNTY	ALL REVOCATIONS DURING PERIOD	STATUS/PLACEMENT REVOCATIONS DURING PERIOD	ALL CLIENTS REVOKED DURING PERIOD	CLIENTS REVOKED FOR STATUS/PLACEMENT REASONS DURING PERIOD
Aiken	4	3	3	3
Anderson	4	4	4	4
Bamberg	2	1	2	1
Berkeley	4	2	3	2
Charleston	7	6	6	5
Cherokee	2	1	2	1
Chester	3	3	2	2
Chesterfield	1	1	1	1
Darlington	7	4	6	4
Fairfield	2	1	2	1
Florence	1	1	1	1
Greenville	12	9	9	7
Greenwood	2	2	1	1
Hampton	1	0	1	0
Jorry	1	1	1	1
Kershaw	2	1	2	1
Lancaster	3	2	2	1
Laurens	2	2	2	2
Lexington	3	2	2	1
McCormick	1	0	1	0
Marion	5	4	5	4
Marlboro	1	0	1	0
Orangeburg	1	1	1	1
Pickens	1	0	1	0
Richland	6	3	5	3
Sumter	8	2	6	2
Spartanburg	5	3	5	3
Union	4	3	4	3
York	5	4	5	4
TOTAL	100	66 (66.0%)	86	59 (68.6%)

MULTIPLE REVOCATIONS DURING PERIOD

Number of Revocations	Frequency
2	12
3	1

Table II

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL CLIENTS
REVOKED BY AGE, RACE AND SEX

Age*	Total		White Male		Non-White Male		White Female		Non-White Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11	1	1.2	1	3.3	0	0.0	0		0	
12	3	3.5	0	0.0	3	12.0	0		0	
13	6	7.0	2	6.7	4	16.0	0		0	
14	14	16.3	3	10.0	6	24.0	2	11.8	3	21.4
15	41	47.7	13	43.3	9	36.0	10	58.8	9	64.3
16	20	23.3	11	36.7	3	12.0	4	23.5	2	14.3
17	1	1.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9	0	0.0
TOTAL:	86	100.0	30	34.9	25	29.1	17	19.8	14	16.3

White: 47 or 54.7% Male: 55 or 64.0%

Non-White: 39 or 45.3% Female: 31 or 36.0%

Average Age: 14.8 years

Table III provides the age, race and sex distribution of 27 clients whose most recent revocation involved a non-status conditional release violation. These youth accounted for approximately 31% of all clients revoked during the study period. Whites and non-whites within this subgroup were represented almost equally, and the vast majority, more than 85%, were males. In contrast, Table IV, which presents those clients revoked for status or placement violations (69% of the total) indicates that the sexes were much more evenly distributed, while the racial composition was approximately 56% white, 44% non-white.

Conditional Release Violations

Table V indicates the complete array of conditional release violations for 27 clients revoked with at least one non-status charge. The most frequent violations within this subgroup were larceny and breaking and entering, although drug/substance abuse and status-type problems such as leaving home/ placement without permission and school-related charges were also common. Almost three-fourths of these youth exhibited multiple violations, as many as four per client.

Table VI presents the distribution of conditional release violations for the 59 clients revoked on status/placement charges only. Almost 60% of the clients violated their conditional release by leaving home or placement without permission while some 39% returned for school related problems, mostly non-attendance. Failure of placement was specified in the revocations of eight clients. In contrast to the clients revoked with non-status violations, fewer than half of the clients revoked because of status or placement problems had multiple violations.

Table III

DISTRIBUTION OF CLIENTS REVOKED FOR NON-STATUS
VIOLATIONS BY AGE, RACE AND SEX

Age*	Total		White Male		Non-White Male		White Female		Non-White Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11	1	3.7	1	9.1						
12	1	3.7			1	8.3				
13	3	11.1	1	9.1	2	16.7				
14	6	22.2	2	18.2	4	33.3				
15	6	22.2	2	18.2	2	16.7	1	33.3	1	100
16	9	33.3	5	45.5	3	25.0	1	33.3		
17	1	3.7					1	33.3		
TOTAL	27	100.0	11	40.7	12	44.4	3	11.1	1	3.7

White: 14 or 51.9% Male: 23 or 85.2%

Non-White: 13 or 48.1% Female: 4 or 14.8%

Average Age: 14.7 years

Table IV

DISTRIBUTION OF CLIENTS REVOKED FOR STATUS OR
PLACEMENT VIOLATIONS BY AGE, RACE AND SEX

Age*	Total		White Male		Non-White Male		White Female		Non-White Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
12	2	3.4			2	15.4				
13	3	5.1	1	5.3	2	15.4				
14	8	13.6	1	5.3	2	15.4	2	14.3	3	23.1
15	35	59.3	11	57.9	7	53.8	9	64.3	8	61.5
16	11	18.6	6	31.6			3	21.4	2	15.4
TOTAL:	59	100.0	19	32.2	13	22.0	14	23.7	13	22.0

White: 33 or 55.9% Male: 32 or 54.2%

Non-White: 26 or 44.1 Female: 27 or 45.8%

Average Age: 14.8 years

Table V

DISTRIBUTION OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE VIOLATIONS
ON CLIENTS REVOKED WITH NON-STATUS CHARGES

Conditional Release Violation*		Percent of Clients (n=27)
NON-STATUS	Assault	3 11.1
	Burning a Building	1 3.7
	Breaking & Entering	7 25.9
	Auto Theft	4 14.8
	Larceny	7 25.9
	Breaking & Entering (Auto)	1 3.7
	Malicious Damage to Private Property (over \$50)	1 3.7
	Escape	1 3.7
	AWOL from temp. CR	2 7.4
	Drug/Substance Abuse	5 18.5
	Possession of knife	1 3.7
	Shoplifting	2 7.4
	Forgery	1 3.7
	DUI	1 3.7
	Use auto w/o owner's permission	1 3.7
	Disorderly Conduct	1 3.7
	Driving w/o License	1 3.7
	Ret. from temp. CR	1 3.7
STATUS**	School Related (#1):	6 22.2
	enrollment 1	
	nonattendance 2	
	expulsion 1	
	suspension 2	
	Residence (#3):	1 3.7
	Left SC w/o permission	
	Left Home/Placement	5 18.5
	without permission (#4)	
	Failure to follow Counselor's Instructions (#5)	1 3.7
	Failure to have reasonable conduct with parents (#9)	1 3.7
	Incorrigible	4 14.8
TOTAL		59

Multiple Violations (20 Clients)

Frequency	$\frac{2}{12}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{4}{4}$
-----------	----------------	---------------	---------------

*Distribution includes only those violations resulting in the most recent revocation during study period.

**Numbers in parentheses refer to the specific J P & A violations. See Appendix for a copy of the Conditional Release Agreement.

Table VI

DISTRIBUTION OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE VIOLATIONS
ON CLIENTS REVOKED FOR STATUS/PLACEMENT REASONS ONLY

Conditional Release Violation*		Percent of Clients (n=59)
School Related (#1):	23	39.0
Non Attendance	17	
Suspension	4	
Expulsion	2	
Failure to Report for Hearing (#2)	3	5.1
Residence Change (#3):	6	10.2
Changed w/o perm.	5	
Left SC w/o perm.	1	
Leaving Home/Placement w/o permission (#4)	35	59.3
Failure to follow Coun- selor's Instructions (#5)	6	10.2
Fighting (#7)	4	6.8
Drinking Alcohol (#8)	1	1.7
Failure to be reason- able in conduct with Parents (#9)	5	8.5
Failure of Placement (#11)	8	13.6
Incorrigible	7	11.9
Other	4	6.8
TOTAL	102	

Multiple Violations (27 Clients)

Frequency	$\frac{2}{17}$	$\frac{3}{7}$	$\frac{4}{2}$	$\frac{7}{1}$
-----------	----------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

*Distributions includes only those violations resulting in the most recent revocation during study period.

**Numbers in parentheses refer to the specific J P & A violations. See Appendix for a copy of the Conditional Release Agreement.

When the information on Tables V and VI is combined, it becomes apparent that, for the entire study population, leaving home/placement without permission was the most frequent violation associated with revocations. This charge was specified for some 47% of all clients returned to DYS. School-related problems also proved common, incorporating about one-third of these youth.

Table VII summarizes conditional release violations for all clients revoked by type of violation and individual clients involved. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that fewer than 20% of the clients returned to DYS had violated their conditional release by committing a serious crime against person or property. When clients with multiple types of violations are considered, the remainder of this population is distributed as follows: For 10 clients (11.6%) the most serious revocation charge, although non-status, was not in the "serious crime category; fifty-one clients (59.3%) faced status-type violations only, while eight clients (9.3%) returned because of placement failure. Three of this latter group had status charges also.

Campus Assignment of Clients Revoked to the Department of Youth Services

Campus assignments of clients revoked during the study period were as follows:

Willow Lane	62	72.1%
John G. Richards	16	18.6%
Birchwood	8	9.3%
Total	86	100.0%

It is apparent that the greatest effect of revocations on population size was felt at the Willow Lane facility, which received more than 70% of all clients returned to the Agency by Juvenile Placement and Aftercare.

Table VII

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE VIOLATIONS

BY TYPE OF VIOLATION: AND INDIVIDUAL

CLIENTS INVOLVED

Type of Conditional Release Violation	Number of Violations this category	Percent of Total	Number of Individual Clients Involved	Percent of all Clients Revoked (n=86)
Serious Crime against Person or Property *	24	14.9	17	19.8%
Other Non-Status	17	10.6	14	16.3%
Status	112	69.6	62	72.1%
Unsuitable Placement or Placement Failure**	8	5.0	8	9.3%
TOTAL	161	100.0	--	--

Multiple Types of Conditional Release Violations

Serious criminal and other non-status violations:	3 clients
Serious criminal, other non-status, and status violations:	1 client
Serious Criminal and Status Violations:	4 clients
Other Non-Status and Status Violations:	4 clients
Status Violations and unsuitable placement:	2 clients
TOTAL	14 clients

*Serious crimes against person and property included the following: assault; burning a building; breaking and entering; auto theft; larceny; breaking and entering (auto); and malicious damage to property in excess of \$50.

**Includes only children cited in violation of J P & A rule #11, or cases in which "failure of placement" or "unsuitable placement" was stated as such. Does not include children who left home or placement without permission in violation of J P & A rule #4.

Tracking Individual Clients by Length of Each Commitment, Total Stay and Offense History

Tables VIII and IX track individual clients through each commitment to a residential school, indicating both length of stay and type of offense associated with the commitments. The tables provide a kind of capsule history of individual experiences with the Department of Youth Services. For example, the first youth noted on Table VIII, which incorporates the 27 clients revoked on non-status charges, is a non-white male first committed to an institution at the age of 11. His four commitments all involved non-status charges, the last two serious criminal activities. By the time of release at the age of 17, to the Department of Corrections to complete a determinate sentence, the client had compiled a total stay at DYS of 4.9 years.

One trend apparent from the information recorded on Tables VIII and IX is that each successive commitment tends to be of shorter duration than previous ones. For those clients whose most recent revocation involved a non-status charge, the first commitment averaged 9.2 months, the second 6.9 months, and the third, where applicable, 6.6 months; comparable figures for clients with status/placement revocations indicate uniformly shorter stays but a similar pattern--8.5, 4.9 and 3.3 months, respectively. For the entire population of clients revoked, the first commitment averaged 8.7 months, the second 5.5 months, and the third 4.9 months. Overall, the average total stay was 14.8 months, 18.6 for clients revoked on non-status charges and 13.5 for those returning for status/placement reasons. Other kinds of data presented on Tables VIII and IX are summarized on Tables X-XIII. Tables X and XI, which deal with average revocation stay and average total stay, are based on the population sub-group of 53 inactive clients--excluded are 33 active clients

Table VIII

TRACKING OF INDIVIDUAL CLIENTS REVOKED FOR NON-STATUS VIOLATIONS
BY LENGTH OF EACH COMMITMENT, TOTAL STAY AND OFFENSE HISTORY

Race & Sex	Age at First Commitment	Age at Revocation (most recent)	Length of Stay in Months				Total Stay at DYS		Offense/Violation History (See Code)			
			Commitment #4	Commitment #3	Commitment #2	Commitment #1			Commitment #4	Commitment #3	Commitment #2	Commitment #1
NWM	11	16	5.5*	17.7	7.0	28.6	58.8	4.9	SC,ONS	SC,ONS	ONS	ONS,ST
NWF	12	15	2.0 inc	4.7	9.7	21.8	38.2	3.2	SC	ONS	ONS,ST	SC,ST
NWM	11	14	11.9 inc	2.0	5.8	8.6	28.3	2.4	SC	SC,ONS	ONS	SC
NWM	12	14	3.1 inc	3.8	10.9	7.2	25.0	2.1	SC,ONS	SC	SC,ONS	SC
WM	14	16	3.8 inc	4.2	1.0	10.0	19.0	1.6	SC,ONS	ONS	ST	ONS
NWM	10	14	-	11.0 inc	19.2	10.1	40.3	3.4	-	ONS,ST	ST	SC
NWM	11	15	-	10.4	13.0	9.7	33.1	2.8	-	SC	ST	ONS
WF	15	17	-	6.6	2.7	10.5	19.8	1.7	-	ONS	ST	SC
WF	15	16	-	1.8 inc	1.3	6.3	9.4	.8	-	SC	ST	SC
WM	14	16	-	3.1	4.8	.9	8.8	.7	-	ONS,ST	ST	ST
WM	13	14	-	-	11.9	7.5	19.5	1.6	-	-	SC,ONS,ST	SC,ONS
NWM	10	13	-	-	7.7	11.7	19.4	1.6	-	-	SC,ST	SC,ST
WM	14	16	-	-	7.9	10.3	18.2	1.5	-	-	SC	ST
WM	13	13	-	-	6.1 inc	10.0	16.1	1.3	-	-	ONS	SC
WM	15	16	-	-	7.1	8.7	15.8	1.3	-	-	SC	SC,ONS,ST
NWM	12	13	-	-	6.9 inc	8.7	15.6	1.3	-	-	SC	SC
WM	13	14	-	-	7.6 inc	7.9	15.5	1.3	-	-	ONS,ST	SC
NWM	14	15	-	-	7.1	6.7	13.8	1.2	-	-	SC	SC
WM	14	15	-	-	8.0 inc	5.1	13.1	1.1	-	-	ONS	SC
NWM	13	14	-	-	6.4	5.5	11.9	1.0	-	-	SC,ST	SC
NWM	13	14	-	-	4.3 inc	6.9	11.3	.9	-	-	SC	ST**
NWM	15	16	-	-	1.0 ***	10.2	11.2	.9	-	-	SC,ST	ONS
NWM	14	16	-	-	1.1	9.8	10.9	.9	-	-	SC,ST	SC
WF	14	15	-	-	4.3	5.6	9.9	.8	-	-	ONS	ONS
WM	15	16	-	-	3.7 inc	5.9	9.6	.8	-	-	ONS,ST	SC
WM	14	15	-	-	1.5	7.7	9.2	.8	-	-	ONS	ONS
WM	10	11	-	-	2.4 inc	5.7	8.1	.7	-	-	ONS	ONS

 \bar{x} =13.0

\bar{x} =6.6 \bar{x} =6.9 \bar{x} =9.2 \bar{x} =18.6 1.6
(averages based on completed stays only)

OFFENSE CODE

*Fourth Commitment was a determinate sentence for burning a building, grand and petty larceny

**Committed for "threatening suicide", breaking school rules, and staying out late at night

***AWOL 29 days after commitment; now in policy custody; not counted in calculating average stays, second commitment

SC=Serious crime against person
or property
ONS=Other Non-Status
ST=Status
PL=Placement

Table IX

TRACKING OF INDIVIDUAL CLIENTS REVOKED FOR STATUS OR PLACEMENT VIOLATIONS BY
LENGTH OF EACH COMMITMENT, TOTAL STAY, AND OFFENSE HISTORY

Race & Sex	Age at First Commitment	Age at Revocation (most recent)	Commitment #4	Length of Stay in Months			Commitment #1	Total Stay at DYS		Offense/Violation History (see code)			
				Commitment #3	Commitment #2	Commitment #1		Mos.	Yrs.	Commitment #4	Commitment #3	Commitment #2	Commitment #1
NWM	11	15	7.0 inc	10.1	1.1	32.3	50.4	4.2	ST	SC	ST	ST	
WM	11	15	.5	8.6	9.1	16.2	34.5	2.9	PL	SC	ST	ST	
NWF	14	16	2.5 inc	4.8	3.8	8.3	19.3	1.6	PL	PL	ST	ONS	
WM	10	14	-	.9	29.2	11.6	41.7	3.5	-	PL	SC	SC	
WM	11	15	-	11.4 inc	21.9	6.7	40.1	3.3	-	ST	ONS	SC	
WM	12	15	-	10.4	7.3	15.7	33.3	2.8	-	ST	PL	SC	
WM	14	16	-	1.6	.5	22.8	24.9	2.1	-	ST	ST	ST*	
NWM	11	13	-	6.4 inc	7.2	7.3	20.9	1.7	-	ST	ONS	SC	
NWM	12	15	-	2.1	11.6	6.3	20.1	1.7	-	ST	SC	ONS	
WF	13	15	-	4.0	7.5	8.2	19.7	1.6	-	ST	ST	ST*	
WF	13	15	-	2.0 inc	4.5	13.0	19.5	1.6	-	ST	ST	ONS,ST	
WM	12	15	-	1.8	2.6	14.5	19.0	1.6	-	ST	ST,ONS	ST	
WF	14	16	-	.9	10.6	6.3	17.8	1.5	-	ST	ONS	ST,ONS	
NWF	14	15	-	1.3 inc	6.7	8.8	16.9	1.4	-	ST	ST	ST,SC	
NWF	12	15	-	.7	6.8	9.0	16.5	1.4	-	ST	ST	ST*	
WM	14	15	-	6.6	.7	8.6	15.9	1.3	-	ST	ST	ST,ONS	
NWF	14	15	-	2.2	10.0	2.7	14.8	1.2	-	ST	ONS	ST	
WM	13	15	-	1.4	7.0	6.3	14.7	1.2	-	ST	ONS	ONS	
NWM	13	13	-	8.2 inc	.4	5.7	14.3	1.2	-	ST	ST	SC	
NWM	13	15	-	1.8	5.7	5.4	12.9	1.1	-	ST	ST	SC	
WF	14	15	-	3.6 inc	1.0	7.3	11.9	1.0	-	ST	ST	SC	
WM	10	13	-	2.2 inc	.9	8.0	11.1	.9	-	ST	ST	ST*	
NWF	14	15	-	.8	8.5	1.9	11.1	.9	-	ST	ONS	ST	
WF	13	14	-	1.0	2.0	5.5	8.5	.7	-	ST	ST	ST*	
NWM	13	15	-	-	13.9 inc	13.0	26.9	2.2	-	-	ST	ONS	
WF	13	15	-	-	6.5 inc	18.7	25.2	2.1	-	-	ST	SC	
NWM	10	12	-	-	4.5 inc	17.4	21.9	1.8	-	-	ST	SC	
NWF	12	15	-	-	.9	16.9	17.8	1.5	-	-	PL	ST	
NWM	14	15	-	-	9.4 inc	8.2	17.6	1.5	-	-	ST	SC	
WM	15	16	-	-	10.0	6.8	16.8	1.4	-	-	ST	ONS,ST	
NWM	12	13	-	-	1.7	15.0	16.7	1.4	-	-	ST	SC,ST	
NWF	14	16	-	-	8.2 inc	5.9	14.1	1.2	-	-	ST	SC	
NWF	14	15	-	-	7.2	6.3	13.5	1.1	-	-	ST	ONS	
WF	15	16	-	-	7.4	6.0	13.5	1.1	-	-	ST	SC,ST	

Table IX cont.

Race & Sex	Age at First Commitment	Age at Revocation (most recent)	Commitment #4	Length of Stay in Months			Commitment #1	Total Stay at DYS		Offense/Violation History (see code)			
				Commitment #3	Commitment #2			Mos.	Yrs.	Commitment #4	Commitment #3	Commitment #2	Commitment #1
WM	14	15	-	-	5.9		6.1	12.0	1.0	-	-	ST	SC,ST
WF	14	15	-	-	5.9 inc		6.1	12.0	1.0	-	-	ST	ST*
WF	13	14	-	-	7.6 inc		4.3	11.9	1.0	-	-	ST	ONS,ST
WF	14	15	-	-	3.8		7.7	11.5	1.0	-	-	ST	ST*
NWF	13	14	-	-	1.6		9.8	11.4	.9	-	-	ST	ST,ONS
WF	15	16	-	-	2.6 inc		8.5	11.1	.9	-	-	ST	ST,ONS
NWM	12	12	-	-	5.2 inc		5.9	11.1	.9	-	-	ST	SC
WM	15	16	-	-	1.5		9.5	11.0	.9	-	-	ST	SC,ONS
NWM	13	15	-	-	1.6		9.0	10.7	.9	-	-	ST	ST*
NWM	13	14	-	-	2.5 inc		7.9	10.4	.9	-	-	ST	SC,ONS
WM	13	15	-	-	2.1		8.3	10.4	.8	-	-	PL	ONS
NWF	14	15	-	-	4.8		5.2	10.1	.8	-	-	ST	ST*
NWM	14	15	-	-	2.2		7.7	9.9	.8	-	-	ST	ONS,ST
WM	14	16	-	-	3.0 inc		6.4	9.4	.8	-	-	ST	ONS
WF	15	15	-	-	.5		7.9	8.4	.7	-	-	ST	ONS,ST
WM	13	15	-	-	.8		7.5	8.3	.7	-	-	ST	SC,ONS
WM	16	16	-	-	3.1		4.3	7.4	.6	-	-	ST	ONS
WM	14	15	-	-	1.0		5.0	6.0	.5	-	-	ST	ST*
WF	15	15	-	-	1.2		4.4	5.6	.5	-	-	PL	SC
WM	14	15	-	-	1.6		2.9	4.5	.4	-	-	ST	ST*
BF	14	15	-	-	2.2		1.6	3.8	.3	-	-	ST	ST*
BF	14	14	-	-	1.7		1.7	3.5	.3	-	-	ST	ST*
BF	15	15	-	-	1.7		1.7	3.5	.3	-	-	ST	ST*
WF	15	15	-	-	2.2		1.2	3.5	.3	-	-	ST	ST*
WM	15	16	-	-	1.2		1.4	2.6	.2	-	-	ST	SC

 $\bar{x}=13.3$ $\bar{x}=3.3$ mos. $\bar{x}=4.9$ mos. $\bar{x}=8.5$ $\bar{x}=13.5$ 1.2

(averages based on completed stays only)

OFFENSE CODE

*Indicates child whose history involves status or placement problems only

SC=Serious crime against person
or property
ONS=Other Non-status
ST=Status
PL=Placement

whose latest revocations are not yet completed. Table XII and XIII, which present offense history data, reflect the entire population of 86 clients.

Average Revocation Stay

Table X presents the average latest revocation stay in months by race, sex and type of release violation, for all inactive clients. There was a marked difference between the length of stay for clients returning with non-status violations (5.8 months) and those returning with status or placement violations (2.7 months). The revocation stays for all 53 inactive clients averaged 3.5 months. Generally, the variable of race did not account for pronounced differences in the revocation stay--the average for all inactive white clients was 3.7 months, non-white clients, 3.3 months. One exception occurred in that the average stay for white males revoked on status/placement violations was longer (3.2 months), as compared to non-white males (1.9 months). Routinely, female clients exhibited much shorter revocation stays than their male counterparts--for all inactive clients, males averaged 4.0 months, females, 2.8 months. It should be noted, however, that 90% of these females returned with status or placement violations.

Average Total Stay in DYS Residential Schools

Table XI presents the average total stay in residential schools by number of commitments, race and sex for all inactive clients. Only two inactive clients experienced four commitments--one, a white male, was confined a total of 34.5 months (2.9 years); the other, a non-white male, for 58.8 months (4.9 years). A total of 18 inactive clients had been committed three times, with stays averaging 19.4 months or 1.6 years. Thirty-three inactive clients with two commitments recorded an average stay of 10.4 months. Thus, the average total stay for all inactive clients was 14.8 months, or 1.2 years.

Table X

AVERAGE REVOCATION STAY IN MONTHS BY RACE, SEX AND
TYPE OF RELEASE VIOLATION FOR INACTIVE CLIENTS

Type of Release Violation	White Male	White Female	Non- White Male	Non- White Female	White	Non- White	Male	Female	Total
Revoked for non- status violations	6.3 (n=5)	5.4 (n=2)	5.6 (n=7)	- (n=0)	6.1 (n=7)	5.6 (n=7)	5.9 (n=12)	5.4 (n=2)	5.8 (n=14)
Revoked for status/ placement violations	3.2 (n=16)	2.6 (n=8)	1.9 (n=5)	2.3 (n=10)	3.0 (n=24)	2.2 (n=15)	2.9 (n=21)	2.5 (n=18)	2.7 (n=39)
All Inactive Clients	3.9 (n=21)	3.2 (n=10)	4.1 (n=12)	2.3 (n=10)	3.7 (n=31)	3.3 (n=22)	4.0 (n=33)	2.8 (n=20)	3.5 (n=53)

Table XI

AVERAGE TOTAL STAY AT DYS RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS IN MONTHS BY
NUMBER OF COMMITMENTS, RACE AND SEX FOR INACTIVE CLIENTS

Number of Commitments	White Male	White Female	Non- White Male	Non- White Female	White	Non- White	Male	Female	Total
4	34.5 (n=1)	-	58.8 (n=1)	-	34.5 (n=1)	58.8 (n=1)	46.7 (n=2)	-	46.7 (n=2)
3	21.9 (n=8)	16.4 (n=4)	22.0 (n=3)	14.2 (n=3)	20.1 (n=12)	18.1 (n=6)	21.9 (n=11)	15.5 (n=7)	19.4 (n=18)
2	10.4 (n=12)	8.2 (n=6)	13.2 (n=8)	8.9 (n=7)	9.7 (n=18)	11.2 (n=15)	11.5 (n=20)	8.6 (n=13)	10.4 (n=33)
All Commitments	15.9 (n=21)	11.5 (n=10)	19.2 (n=12)	10.5 (n=10)	14.5 (n=31)	15.2 (n=22)	17.1 (n=33)	11.0 (n=20)	14.8 (n=53)

Both race and sex proved to be significant variables in analyzing total stay. For example, taking into account all inactive clients, the average total stay of non-white males exceeded that of white males by 3.3 months. The average total stay for all females, at 11.0 months, was fully six months less than the average stay for males.

Offense History

Table XII represents an effort to summarize the commitment offenses of all clients revoked during the study period by categorizing their histories into five mutually exclusive "patterns." These patterns are juxtaposed with number of commitments so that consistency of behavior over time can be gauged.

Pattern I incorporates 16 clients (19% of the total) whose commitment offenses were exclusively status/placement in nature. Five of these youth have maintained the pattern through three commitments. Conversely, Pattern II reflects 19 clients (22% of the total) whose commitments derived from non-status offenses. Four youth have sustained the pattern through four commitments.

Pattern III represents the most common offense history manifested by clients revoked during the study period--that is, an initial commitment deriving from a non-status charge, with any subsequent commitments resulting from status or placement violations only. This pattern incorporated some 36% of all clients including one who returned three times for status/placement violations and six who returned twice.

Pattern IV, the direct opposite of "Pattern III" and the least common among all clients revoked, includes those youth whose initial commitments

Table XII

OFFENSE HISTORY PATTERNS
BY NUMBER OF COMMITMENTS

Pattern	All Commitments		Number of Commitments							
			4		3		2			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
I. Consistently Status Offenders	16	18.6	0	0.0	5	19.2	11	21.2		
II. Consistently non- Status Offenders	19	22.1	4	50.0	0	0.0	15	28.8		
III. Initial Commitment on Non-Status Charge-all recommitments/revoca- tions for status or placement violations	31	36.0	1	12.5	6	23.1	24	46.2		
IV. Initial Commitment on Status Charge - recommit- ments/revocation(s) for non-status violation (crossover pattern)	8	9.3	2	25.0	4	15.4	2	3.8		
V. Mixed History including 2 or more commitments on non-status charges/ violations	12	14.0	1	12.5	11	42.3	0	0.0		
TOTAL	86	100.0	8	9.3	26	30.2	52	60.5		

for status offenses were followed by one or more commitments for non-status violations. This pattern is often termed "crossover" or is said to demonstrate an "escalation" from status to criminal activity. Eight clients, only 9.3% of the total, were thus categorized and six of the eight (75%) had three or four commitments. Finally, Pattern V incorporates clients with a "mixed" history of status and non-status charges. At least two commitments, including the first, resulted from criminal activity. This pattern was reflected in the histories of 14% of all clients revoked.

When the information on Table XII is combined it becomes apparent that a solid majority of clients revoked during the study period, some 47 or 55%, exhibit Patterns I and III---either they had no commitments relating to non-status charges, or only the first commitment involved criminal activity. At the same time, since only 26% of the clients in this grouping experienced more than two commitments, maintenance over time is not well established. The merging of Patterns II, IV and V results in a grouping of 39 clients, 45% of the study population, characterized either by commitment histories which began with non-status offenses and demonstrated some repetition thereof, or those which represented "crossovers" from status to non-status charges. Within this grouping some 56% had been committed three or four times.

Table XIII summarizes types of commitment offenses/violations by commitment number for all clients revoked during the study period. Commitment offenses/violations include only one charge--the most serious--per client. Thus, a serious criminal charge would be recorded for a client whose commitment order specified charges of auto theft and running away. For more than 70% of all clients, the first commitment resulted from non-status charges.

Table XIII

TYPE OF COMMITMENT OFFENSE/VIOLATION*
BY COMMITMENT NUMBER

Category of Offense/ Violation	Commitment No.									
	All		4		3		2		1	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Serious Criminal	63	29.4	5	62.5	7	20.6	13	15.1	38	44.2
Other Criminal	47	22.0	0	0.0	6	17.6	18	20.9	23	26.7
Status	96	44.9	1	12.5	19	55.9	51	59.3	25	29.1
Placement	8	3.7	2	25.0	2	5.9	4	4.7	0	0.0
TOTAL	214	100.0	8	100.0	34	100.0	86	100.0	86	100.0

*One violation per client -- The most serious violation is used --
for example, a client committed for grand larceny, vandalism, and
not attending school would be counted in the serious criminal
category because of the larceny charge.

In distinct contrast, a large majority, more than 60% of all second and third commitments, derived from status or placement-type violations. Clients who experienced four commitments numbered only eight. However, in five cases the most recent revocation, or fourth commitment resulted from a serious criminal charge.

Time Span Between Conditional Release and Revocation

Table XIV presents the time span between conditional release and revocation for all clients revoked during the study period by type of conditional release violation. Clearly, the first two months represent a critical period, as more than one-third of all revocations occurred within this time span. Furthermore, some 57% of all clients returned within four months of their release. Clients revoked on non-status violations demonstrated a somewhat higher percentage of returns within the four month period than those revoked for status or placement reasons--63% compared to 54%. Fewer than 10% of all clients remained in the community for more than one year before their readmission to the Agency.

Table XIV completes the statistical analyzation of revocations to the Department of Youth Services between March 16, 1978, and March 15, 1979. The next section of this report is intended to highlight the "placement issue" alluded to in the Introduction by presenting several case histories of children confined recently in Agency facilities because of placement failure.

CASE HISTORIES

Summarized below are the histories of four clients returned to the Department of Youth Services after January 1, 1979, that is, following

Table XIV

TIME SPAN BETWEEN RELEASE AND REVOCATION*

BY TYPE OF CONDITIONAL RELEASE VIOLATION

ALL CLIENTS					CLIENTS WITH NON- STATUS VIOLATIONS			CLIENTS WITH STATUS/ PLACEMENT VIOLATIONS		
Days	Months	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent	Number	Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 - 61	0 - 2	30	34.9	34.9	10	37.0	37.0	20	33.9	33.9
62 - 122	2 - 4	19	22.1	57.0	7	25.9	62.9	12	20.3	54.2
123 - 182	4 - 6	9	10.5	67.5	3	11.1	74.0	6	10.2	64.4
183 - 243	6 - 8	9	10.5	78.0	2	7.4	81.4	7	11.9	76.3
244 - 304	8 - 10	6	7.0	85.0	1	3.7	85.1	5	8.5	84.8
305 - 365	10 - 12	5	5.8	90.8	2	7.4	92.5	3	5.1	89.9
366 - 547	12 - 18	5	5.8	96.6	0	0.0	92.5	5	8.5	98.4
548 - 730	18 - 24	2	2.3	98.9	1	3.7	96.2	1	1.7	100.1
more than 730	more than 24	1	1.2	100.1	1	3.7	99.9	0	0.0	-
TOTAL		86	100.1	-	27	99.9	-	59	100.1	-

Range: 7 days - 2.1 years

Range: 23 days - 2.1 years

Range: 7 days - 1.8 years

*Refers to the most recent revocation occurring during period

implementation of the J P & A policy that placement failure does not constitute adequate ground for revocation. Supporting documentation is on file with the Research and Evaluation Unit.

Case No. 1

This 15 year old white male has experienced four commitments to the Department of Youth Services, recording a total stay of some 34.5 months. He not only has a history of serious criminal activity, but also at least one instance of attempted suicide. His most recent stay with the Agency began on March 8, 1979, and lasted 16 days, until J P & A ascertained that placement failure was the "determining factor" in his return and, therefore, that he would not appear before the April Board for "formal" revocation action. He was then released to a parent.

Case No. 2

This 16 year old black female has experienced four commitments to the Agency, including three revocations during the study period. Only the initial commitment reflected a non-status offense (vandalism). The client's most recent revocation, beginning on February 27, 1979, was attributed to placement with parents being "unsuitable." She was granted a placement furlough some months later, but ran away from placement to rejoin her parents. As of this writing the girl remains in Agency custody, and, according to the information in her file, chance of release in the near future appears slight.

Case No. 3

This 14 year old white male has a complex history which includes profound

sexual and physical abuse in the home of relatives prior to his first commitment to the Agency at age 10 for violation of probation, non-status. His initial revocation also reflected criminal charges. On March 7, 1979, he returned a second time for leaving placement at Alston Wilkes without permission.

J P & A reviewed the case at the end of March, indicated then that placement failure was the determining factor, and arranged for alternative placement with the child's parents to begin on April 2.

Case No. 4

This 15 year old white female was initially committed for grand larceny. After a stay of 4.5 months, she was released to her mother. She returned to Willow Lane on March 9, 1979, because her placement at home had become unsuitable, and remained for a total of 35 days, until April 12, 1979. Details of the release were not included in the client's DYS folder.

Case histories 1,3, and 4 document the continued use of DYS facilities to shelter children pending determination by J P & A of whether placement failure was the primary factor responsible for the child's problem in the community. Once such a determination is made, the child may still be detained for several more days, while alternative placement is sought. Case number 2 illustrates a long term stay that resulted, according to all records on hand, from unsuitable placement; as of this writing, the client has been confined at Willow Lane School for 4.5 months.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The statistical analysis presented in this report reflects a population base of 86 clients who accounted for some 100 revocations during a one year

period beginning in March, 1978. Since the number of revocations resulting from status/placement violations was the primary issue which precipitated the study, it is important to note by way of summary, that more than two-thirds of these clients returned to DYS custody for precisely such reasons. Serious criminal charges, on the other hand, accounted for only about one-fifth of the revocations.

The examination of offense histories for each individual client revealed that a clear majority could be categorized one of two ways: either the first commitment only was non-status in nature and any revocation(s) derived from status/placement violations, or all admissions had resulted from status/placement problems. Thus, repeated institutionalization was not associated so much with children manifesting recurrent criminal infractions as those whose commitment record demonstrated, in effect, a "de-escalation" pattern or, whose histories were entirely devoid of non-status offenses. Stated another way, if revocations had been limited to youth whose conditional release violations reflected recurrent criminal behavior and those whose violations represented an "escalation" from status to non-status offenses, then the client population for this study would have been reduced by more than one-half. Moreover, the fact that an "escalation" pattern was the least common among clients revoked complements the findings of a recently completed court study in which it was revealed that only 29% of a sample of juvenile recidivists with prior histories of status charges had "crossed over" to non-status activities.²

² _____., Juveniles Processed through the South Carolina Courts: FY 1977. (Research and Evaluation Unit: South Carolina Department of Youth Services, 1978), p.11.

Type of conditional release violation was found to be one of two variables substantially affecting length of revocation stay. Clients returning with non-status violations remained in Agency facilities, on the average, more than twice as long as those revoked on status/placement violations. Additionally, females registered much shorter revocation stays than males, although the fact that a vast majority of female clients returned for status or placement reasons must be taken into account. Average total stay also varied according to sex, again with males recording substantially longer confinements than females, as did non-white clients when compared to white clients. Taking all clients into account, revocation stays averaged about three and one-half months, total stays nearly fifteen months. Examination of length of stay for all commitments/revocations by chronological order revealed that the average stay for each successive commitment was less than the previous one, i.e., third commitments were of shorter duration than second commitments, second commitments shorter than first. One possible explanation for this pattern is that many of the first commitments and, in some cases, the second commitments occurred several years ago when, perhaps, clients were held for longer periods of time.

In terms of the time span between conditional release and revocation, generally clients were revoked very shortly after release with approximately one-third returning to DYS within two months, one-half within four months. Revocations occurring one year or more after conditional release were unusual, with fewer than one in ten clients remaining in the community longer than twelve months before committing a violation. These findings also hold true when the client population was analyzed by subgroups according to type of conditional release violation (status/placement or non status).

The study results summarized above suggest that the first step toward reducing the number of revocations may be recognition of and increased attention to the critical period of the first months following conditional release when relatively minor problems relating to re-adjustment are likely to surface. Given this premise, two logical questions follow: 1) Are the institutions fulfilling their role in the rehabilitative process; and 2) Are too many clients being revoked because of minor problems which might be handled through community resources in a manner more expedient, more economical and more beneficial to the child than re-incarceration?

It is apparent that the Department of Youth Services and Juvenile Placement and Aftercare might play a more effective role in the prevention of revocations by examining both the adequacy of institutional programs designed to prepare clients for community re-entry and the adequacy of follow-up services provided after discharge to facilitate a smooth transition from institutional to community living. Perhaps the primary need is for better coordination of services between these agencies, or, there may be a kind of void best filled by a new program in the format of a halfway house. In any event, it appears that mechanisms to teach and reinforce the "survival skills" necessary for successful reintegration into the home setting must assume priority if the issue of revocations due to status-type problems is to be resolved.

A separate issue highlighted by the case histories presented in the body of this report is the continued presence in DYS residential schools of children whose only "offense" is inadequate placement. These youth have a highly ambiguous status in that they may remain in DYS custody for periods sometimes exceeding one month awaiting a formal hearing, a formal revocation,

or some kind of determination by J P & A that their case is one of placement failure and therefore does not qualify as a revocation. Would it not be preferable to anticipate that a certain number of children will develop placement problems, and, therefore, establish a process for dealing with placement failure that does not require further incarceration? If "quasi revocations" deriving from placement problems could be eliminated, along with at least the majority of those revocations resulting from status offenses, then it seems that the Department of Youth Services would be in a better position to serve those youth whose histories of repeated criminal activities underscore the need for further Agency intervention.

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF
JUVENILE PLACEMENT AND AFTERCARE

CONDITIONAL RELEASE AGREEMENT

Date

I fully understand that I am being conditionally released from the South Carolina Department of Youth Services, and will be under the supervision of the South Carolina Department of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare until _____.

I understand that I will be expected to follow the rules outlined below and any violation of these rules will be cause to return me to the Department of Youth Services to await a formal hearing by the South Carolina Board of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare which will determine whether or not my conditional release will be revoked.

1. I will enroll in school and I will attend all classes on a regular basis and will obey the rules and regulations of that school so as not to be suspended or expelled from school.
2. Until I am released from supervision, I will make a full and truthful report to the State Board of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare each month on the form provided. This will be done between the first and third day of each month.
3. I will not change my place of residence, my school or my employment, or leave the State unless I have the permission of my Counselor.
4. I shall not absent myself from my Home, School, or Place of Work, without the written permission of my parents/guardian, proper school authority or my job supervisor, respectively.
5. I will allow my JP&A Counselor to visit me at Home, School, or Job or other places and will follow all instructions he gives me.
6. I will not have in my possession a pistol, illegal knife, slingshot, metal or brass knuckles, razor, ice pick, blackjack, length of chain, club or any other weapon/instrument which could cause injury to other persons.
7. I will not fight with other persons or do anything that could harm or be intended to harm or injure any other person.
8. I will not drink any alcoholic beverages, including beer and wines. I will not sniff glue, paint, gasoline or any other dangerous volatiles. I will not purchase, use or have in my possession any marijuana, heroin or other illegal substances which are harmful or habit forming. I will not have in my possession or use any drugs which have not been prescribed for me.
9. I recognize that as a condition of my release, I agree to conduct myself in a reasonable and responsible manner in my relationship with my parents, foster parents, school authorities, JP&A Counselor and other people. I agree that my Conduct will be honest, fair and courteous to those involved.
10. I will not do anything that violates any Federal, State or Municipal law.
11. I understand that in the event my placement with my parents, foster parents, placement family, or other placement becomes unsuitable, as determined by the Staff of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare, whether my fault or not, it may be necessary for me to be returned to the Department of Youth Services until a suitable home is found.
12. I also understand that special rules may be added or these rules may be modified by the Board of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare at any time while I am on Conditional Release, and IF I HAVE ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING MY ACTIVITIES, I WILL ASK MY JP&A COUNSELOR.

13. Additional rules: I also agree that I _____

If my behavior remains good for a period of twelve (12) months from this date, I will be eligible for termination of this conditional release, if I am recommended by my counselor.

I have had the rules fully explained to me and I agree to each of them.

Signature of Juvenile

Placement Parents

Address

I certify that the above rules have been read and explained to _____, and he/she has agreed to them, and has been given a copy, and has been assigned the below named Counselor from the Department of Juvenile Placement and Aftercare.

Counselor:

Director, Department of Juvenile
Placement and Aftercare

Date